

Appl. Ser. No. 10/812,124
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2009

APP 1530

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending, with claims 1, 8 and 11 amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 can be found in paragraph [13] of the specification. Support for the amendments to claim 11 can be found in paragraph [14] of the specification. Claims 1 and 8 are also amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been entered.

In the Final Official Action, claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar, U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0085931 in view of Dommety et al, "Fast Handovers for Mobile IPv6", (hereinafter "Dommety") and in further view of Dennison et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,847,822, (hereinafter "Dennison").

Applicant herein amends independent claims 1 and 8 to more clearly recite the invention. In particular, the amended claims recite said first information gateway predicts said second information gateway *in accordance with said geographic location of said mobile user unit*. Hence, in the claimed invention, the first information gateway uses the GPS information to predict which gateway should be used next, that is, which the second gateway should be. None of the art of record teaches or suggests this limitation, and the Examiner does not state otherwise.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any combination thereof, teach or even suggest the claimed invention of independent claims 1 and 8. It is respectfully submitted that for the reasons set forth above, claims 1 and 8 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Claims 5-7 and 9 are dependent claims, dependent upon claims 1 and 8, respectively, and should likewise be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Appln. Ser. No. 10/812,124
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2009

APP 1530

Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar, in view of Dennison, further in view of Dommety and further in view of Johnson et al., U.S. 6,625,135, (hereinafter "Johnson"). Claims 2-4 are dependent upon claim 1 and Johnson fails to provide the missing elements of claim 1, that is, said first information gateway predicts said second information gateway in accordance with said geographic location of said mobile user unit, and hence, claims 2-4 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar, in view of Dennison, further in view of Dommety and further in view of Budka et al., U.S. 7,224,983, (hereinafter "Budka"). Claim 10 is dependent upon independent claim 8 and Budka fails to provide the missing steps in claim 8. That is, Budka does not teach or suggest predicting said second information gateway using said first information gateway in accordance with the geographic location. Hence, claim 10 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar in view of Dommety.

Claim 11 is amended to recite that IP address information is gathered from users of non-mobile devices and the stored available IP information is in accordance with the gathered information.

None of the cited references, whether taken alone or in any combination thereof, teach or even suggest gathering IP address information from users of non-mobile devices and storing available IP information that reflects this gathered information, and the Examiner does not state otherwise. It is respectfully submitted that for at least this reason, claim 11 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Appln. Ser. No. 10/812,124
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2009

APP 1530

Claims 12-14 were under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar in view of Dommety in further view of Johnson.

Claims 12-14 are dependent claims, dependent upon claim 11. Johnson fails to provide the missing step in claim 11. That is, Johnson does not teach or suggest gathering IP address information regarding users of non-mobile devices. Hence, claims 12-14 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued.

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip J. Feig Reg. No. 27328/

Phillip Feig
Registration No.: 27,328
732-699-7997